

- inadequate information about the application to permit the tribes to respond; and
- unhappiness that Duffy and Skibine were unwilling to decide against the application during the meeting.¹⁶²

Skibine's notes indicate he and Duffy expressed in the meeting that DOI generally supports tribes in their gaming efforts "as a means to self-sufficiency and economic development." They told the meeting attendees that the IGMS staff was preparing a report to the IGMS director, but that there was no deadline for a decision on the application and additional material could be submitted directly to IGMS. Duffy also agreed to the Minnesota congressional delegation's request for another meeting before DOI would issue a final decision. Skibine's notes indicate they explained at the meeting that a positive recommendation from Interior would be insufficient without concurrence by the Governor, but Skibine's notes reflect that the tribal representatives "made it clear that they [did] not want to chance this on the action of the Wisconsin Governor." Duffy told investigators that he did factor into his eventual analysis of the Hudson matter his

¹⁶²On his own initiative, Hartman later wrote a memo to Skibine responding to the concerns listed in Skibine's notes. He noted that all of the Minnesota and Wisconsin tribes except one were consulted by the MAO. He stated the Shakopee's historical claim to this land was not legally valid, and rejected the idea that the tribes' right to establish a casino was based solely on the results of any referendum. Hartman noted that over time the position of local governments on the dog track and on Indian gaming had varied and only 80 opposing letters from the public had been received. In response to the complaint that the tribes and municipalities lacked information to develop adequate impact analyses, Hartman agreed that it might be helpful in the future for area offices to provide more extensive information about applications. On the other hand, he rejected the notion that IGMS should provide any information about the status of an application beyond the fact that it was under review. As for the Minnesota tribes' professed concern about the effect of a Hudson casino on the politics of Minnesota Indian gaming, Hartman asserted that "[p]olitical expediency for tribes in Minnesota is not binding on other tribes and states." Memo from Thomas Hartman to George Skibine, undated. Skibine reported that he reviewed and considered Hartman's response.